



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/058,198	01/25/2002	Robert C. Houvener	6563	3905
25702	7590	06/03/2005	EXAMINER	
SCOTT C. RAND, ESQ. MCLANE, GRAF, RAULERSON & MIDDLETON, PA 900 ELM STREET, P.O. BOX 326 MANCHESTER, NH 03105-0326			KIM, CHONG R	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2623	

DATE MAILED: 06/03/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/058,198

Applicant(s)

HOUVENER, ROBERT C.

Examiner

Charles Kim

Art Unit

2623

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 November 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 25 January 2002 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 1/25, 2/2, 6/17.
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Response to Amendment and Arguments*

1. Applicant's amendment filed on November 22, 2004 has been entered and made of record.
2. Applicant's election with traverse of group I, claims 1-6 in the reply filed on November 22, 2004 is acknowledged. The traversal is on the ground(s) that the restricted groups are not independent and distinct. This is found persuasive and therefore, the restriction requirement is withdrawn. Claims 1-20 will be considered for examination.

### *Double Patenting*

3. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

4. Claims 1 and 20 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 2 of U.S. Patent No. 6,757,408. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because claims 1 and 20 of the instant application cover equivalent subjection matter and are merely a

broader recitation of claim 1 of the patent.

*Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lo et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,960,101 ("Lo").

Referring to claim 1, Lo discloses a security identification system for providing information regarding subjects to be identified, verified, or both, the system comprising:

- a. biometric data input means for receiving biometric data regarding a subject (col. 5, lines 62-66);
- b. biometric analysis means for analyzing the biometric data and comparing it against known biometric data in a database, and for providing match data (score) that is indicative of whether a match exists (col. 6, lines 1-13 and col. 8, lines 34-43);
- c. expert analysis means for automatically providing the biometric data to an analyst workstation (expert matching function) if the match data is below a certain correlation threshold [col. 6, lines 58-66 and figure 1. Note that the "expert matching function" 220 analyzes the biometric data that are matched in the previous step 210, and therefore the biometric data processed in the previous step 210 that have match data below a certain correlation threshold will be provided to the analyst workstation); and

d. security clearance output means coupled to the biometric analysis means and to the expert analysis means for providing an indication of whether the subject is identified, verified, or both (col. 6, lines 64-66).

Lo does not explicitly disclose that the biometric analysis means determines whether the match is above a certain correlation threshold. However, Lo explains that the biometric analysis means produces an “ordered list” of possible matching biometric data (col. 6, lines 1-11). Note that the “ordered list” is produced based on the match data (scores) [col. 8, lines 34-43]. The Examiner notes that in the process of determining the “ordered list”, it would have been obvious to compare the match of each biometric data with a correlation threshold. The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to eliminate the biometric data that have low match data (below the correlation threshold) and provide only the ordered list of biometric data (above the correlation threshold) that are considered possible matches to the expert analysis means (expert matching function) for further detailed analysis.

Referring to claim 20, see the rejection of at least claim 1 above.

6. Claims 2-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Lo et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,960,101 (“Lo”) and Pollard et al., U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0109579 (“Pollard”).

Referring to claim 2, Lo does not explicitly disclose that the biometric data input means includes a miniature camera. However, this feature was exceedingly well known in the art. For example, Pollard discloses a biometric data input means that includes a miniature camera (10) [page 2, paragraphs 29 and 33 and figure 1].

Lo and Pollard are combinable because they are both concerned with security identification systems. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the biometric data input means of Lo so that it includes a miniature camera, as taught by Pollard. The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to enhance the ergonomics of the security identification system by providing a portable biometric data input means. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Lo with Pollard to obtain the invention as specified in claim 2.

Referring to claim 3, Lo does not explicitly disclose that the biometric data input means includes a micro display that is viewable only by a screener that is using the biometric data input means. However, this feature was exceedingly well known in the art. For example, Pollard discloses a biometric data input means that includes a micro display (12) that is viewable only by a screener that is using the biometric data input means (page 2, paragraphs 29-35 and figure 1).

Lo and Pollard are combinable because they are both concerned with security identification systems. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the biometric data input means of Lo so that it includes a micro display, as taught by Pollard. The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to enhance the ergonomics of the security identification system by providing a portable biometric data input means. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Lo with Pollard to obtain the invention as specified in claim 3.

7. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Lo et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,960,101 ("Lo") and Ortiz, U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0091937 ("Ortiz").

Referring to claim 4, Lo does not explicitly disclose that the biometric data input means includes a microphone. However, this feature was exceedingly well known in the art. For example, Ortiz discloses a biometric data input means that includes a microphone (page 7, paragraphs 89-90).

Lo and Ortiz are combinable because they are both concerned with security identification systems. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the biometric data input means of Lo so that it includes a microphone, as taught by Ortiz. The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to enhance the flexibility of the security identification system by providing the capability of accepting a variety of different types of biometric data. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Lo with Ortiz to obtain the invention as specified in claim 4.

8. Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Lo et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,960,101 ("Lo"), Pollard et al., U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0109579 ("Pollard"), and Crank, U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0130771 ("Crank").

Referring to claim 5, Lo does not explicitly disclose that the biometric data input means includes an earphone, a microphone, a miniature camera, and a micro display.

Pollard discloses a biometric data input means that includes an earphone (18), a miniature camera (10) and a micro display (14) [figures 1-2].

Lo and Pollard are combinable because they are both concerned with security identification systems. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the biometric data input means of Lo so that it includes an earphone, miniature camera, and micro display, as taught by Pollard. The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to enhance the portability of the biometric data input means. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Lo with Pollard.

Lo and Pollard do not explicitly disclose that the biometric data input device includes a microphone. However, this feature was exceedingly well known in the art. For example, Crank discloses a biometric data input means that includes a microphone (page 10, paragraphs 193-196).

Lo, Pollard, and Crank are combinable because they are all concerned with security identification systems. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the biometric data input means of Lo and Pollard to include the microphone of Crank. The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to enhance the security of the identification system (Crank, page 10, paragraph 193). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Lo and Pollard with Crank to obtain the invention as specified in claim 5.

9. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Lo et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,960,101 ("Lo") and Oliver, U.S. Patent No. 6,289,140 ("Oliver").



Referring to claim 6, Lo further discloses that the biometric data input means includes a computer processor that is coupled to a camera (col. 5, lines 21-25), but does not explicitly disclose that the camera is programmed to take a picture responsive to information received by a microphone during normal conversation by a screener.

Oliver discloses a camera that is programmed to take a picture responsive to information received by a microphone during normal conversation by an operator (col. 1, lines 60-62 and col. 3, line 12-col. 4, line 30).

Lo and Oliver are combinable because they are both concerned with image processing systems. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the camera of Lo so that it is programmed to take a picture responsive to information received by a microphone during normal conversation by a screener, as taught by Oliver. The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to reduce the number of user input buttons and the overall size of the camera (Oliver, col. 1, lines 63-67). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Lo with Oliver to obtain the invention as specified in claim 6.

10. Claims 7-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Pollard et al., U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0109579 ("Pollard"), Lo et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,960,101 ("Lo"), O'Hara, U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0058084 ("O'Hara"), and Crank, U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0130771 ("Crank").

Referring to claim 7, see the discussion of at least claim 5 above. Pollard discloses a security identification system for providing information regarding subjects to be identified, verified, or both, the system comprising:

- a. a headset that may be worn by a screener, the headset including an earphone, a camera, and a display (figures 1-2);
- b. a headset processor coupled to the headset for processing image data received by the camera and for transmitting processed image data to a central facility (page 2, paragraphs 33-34), the central facility including:
  - i. a storage medium including data regarding known individuals (page 2, paragraphs 33-34),
  - ii. an analysis processor for comparing the processed image data with the data regarding known individuals and for producing match data indicative of the level of match of the processed image data with the data regarding known individuals (page 2, paragraphs 33-46).

Pollard does not explicitly disclose an expert analyst workstation for automatically receiving the processed image data if the match data indicates that a match is a weak match. However, this feature was exceedingly well known in the art. For example, Lo discloses an expert analyst workstation (expert matching function) for automatically receiving processed image data if match data indicates that a match is a weak match (col. 6, lines 58-66 and figure 1. Note that the “expert matching function” 220 analyzes the biometric data that are matched in the previous step 210, and therefore the biometric data processed in the previous step 210 that have

Art Unit: 2623

match data indicating that a match is a weak match will be provided to the expert analyst workstation).

Pollard and Lo are combinable because they are both concerned with security identification systems. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the security identification system of Pollard to include the expert analyst workstation of Lo. The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to enhance the accuracy of the identification system (Lo, col. 1, lines 56-58). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Pollard with Lo.

Pollard and Lo do not explicitly disclose that the storage medium includes data regarding known high-risk individuals. However, this feature was exceedingly well known in the art. For example, O'Hara discloses a storage medium that includes data regarding known high-risk individuals (page 4, paragraph 41).

Pollard, Lo, and O'Hara are combinable because they are all concerned with security identification systems. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the storage medium of Pollard and Lo so that it includes data regarding known high-risk individuals, as taught by O'Hara. The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to provide greater safety and security (O'Hara, page 1, paragraph 2). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Pollard and Lo with O'Hara.

Pollard, Lo, and O'Hara do not explicitly disclose that the headset includes a microphone. However, this feature was exceedingly well known in the art. For example, Crank discloses a headset that includes a microphone (page 10, paragraphs 193-196).

Pollard, Lo, O'Hara, and Crank are combinable because they are all concerned with security identification systems. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the headset of Pollard, Lo, and O'Hara so that it includes a microphone, as taught by Crank. The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to enhance the security of the identification system (Crank, page 10, paragraph 193). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Pollard, Lo, and O'Hara with Crank Oliver to obtain the invention as specified in claim 7.

Referring to claim 8, Pollard further discloses that the headset includes a micro display (14) [figure 1].

Referring to claim 9, Pollard further discloses that the headset includes a miniature camera (10) [figure 1].

Referring to claims 10 and 11, Pollard, Lo, O'Hara, and Crank do not explicitly disclose that the system further provides training and performance feedback for each screener. However, the Examiner notes that providing training and performance feedback for an operator of a device was exceedingly well known in the art. In this case, it would have been obvious to provide the training and performance feedback for each screener in order to ensure that each screener is performing his/her duties properly.

11. Claims 12-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Pollard et al., U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0109579 ("Pollard") and Oliver, U.S. Patent No. 6,289,140 ("Oliver").

Referring to claim 12, Pollard discloses a biometric data acquisition system for use in a security identification system, the data acquisition system comprising a unit that may be worn by a screener, the unit including a camera that is configured to take a picture (page 2, paragraphs 29-46 and figure 1).

Pollard does not explicitly disclose that the camera is configured to take a picture responsive to the sound of the screener saying a certain trigger word during a normal conversation by the screener. However, this feature was exceedingly well known in the art. For example, Oliver discloses a camera that is configured to take a picture responsive to the sound of an operator saying a certain trigger word during a normal conversation (col. 1, lines 60-62 and col. 3, line 12-col. 4, line 30).

Pollard and Oliver are combinable because they are both concerned with image processing systems. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the camera of Pollards so that it is configured to take a picture responsive to the sound of the screener saying a certain trigger word during a normal conversation by the screener, as taught by Oliver. The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to reduce the number of user input buttons and the overall size of the camera (Oliver, col. 1, lines 63-67). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Pollard with Oliver to obtain the invention as specified in claim 12.

Referring to claim 13, Pollard further discloses that the picture includes image data of a person's face from which biometric data may be extracted (page 2, paragraphs 33-46).

Referring to claim 14, Pollard and Oliver do not explicitly disclose that the picture includes image data of an iris of a person's eye from which biometric data may be extracted.

Art Unit: 2623

However, Official notice is taken that image data of an iris of a person's eye from which biometric data may be extracted was exceedingly well known in the art. Therefore, it would have been obvious to modify the picture of Pollard and Oliver so that it comprises image data of an iris of a person's eye. The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to enhance the flexibility of the identification system by providing the capability of accepting a variety of different types of biometric data.

12. Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Pollard et al., U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0109579 ("Pollard"), Oliver, U.S. Patent No. 6,289,140 ("Oliver"), and O'Hara, U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0058084 ("O'Hara").

Referring to claim 15, Pollard discloses a method of verifying the identity of a person, the method comprising:

- a. taking a picture of the person while looking at the person (page 1, paragraph 9 and page 2, paragraph 33);
- b. forwarding data representative of the picture of the person to a central facility that includes data regarding known individuals in a central storage medium (page 2, paragraphs 32-34);
- c. analyzing the data representative of the picture at the central facility (page 2, paragraphs 32-46).

Pollard does not explicitly disclose the step of stating a keyword and taking a picture responsive to the keyword. However, this feature was exceedingly well known in the art. For

example, Oliver discloses the step of stating a keyword and taking a picture responsive to the keyword (col. 1, lines 60-62 and col. 3, line 12-col. 4, line 30).

Pollard and Oliver are combinable because they are both concerned with image processing methods. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the picture taking step of Pollard so that a picture is taken in response to a stated keyword, as taught by Oliver. The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to reduce the number of user input buttons and the overall size of the camera used to take the picture (Oliver, col. 1, lines 63-67). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Pollard with Oliver.

Pollard and Oliver do not explicitly disclose that the central storage medium includes data regarding known high-risk individuals. However, this feature was exceedingly well known in the art. For example, O'Hara discloses a storage medium that includes data regarding known high-risk individuals (page 4, paragraph 41).

Pollard, Oliver, and O'Hara are combinable because they are all concerned with image processing methods. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the storage medium of Pollard and Oliver so that it includes data regarding known high-risk individuals, as taught by O'Hara. The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to provide greater safety and security (O'Hara, page 1, paragraph 2). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Pollard and Oliver with O'Hara to obtain the invention as specified in claim 15.

13. Claims 16-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Pollard et al., U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0109579 ("Pollard"), Oliver, U.S. Patent No. 6,289,140 ("Oliver"), O'Hara, U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0058084 ("O'Hara"), and Lo et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,960,101 ("Lo").

Referring to claim 16, Pollard further discloses the step of determining whether a match exists between the data representative of the picture and any of the data regarding known individuals (page 2, paragraphs 33-46). Note that the combination of Pollard and Oliver disclose the step of determining whether a match exists between the data representative of the picture and any of the data regarding known high-risk individuals (see discussion of claim 15).

Pollard, Oliver, and O'Hara do not explicitly disclose the step of generating match data that is indicative of whether a match exists and whether the match is strong or weak. However, this feature was exceedingly well known in the art. For example, Lo discloses the step of generating match data (match scores) that is indicative of whether a match exists and whether the match is strong or weak (col. 8, lines 34-44).

Pollard, Oliver, O'Hara, and Lo are combinable because they are all concerned with image processing methods. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the method of Pollard, Oliver, and O'Hara so that it includes the step of generating match data that is indicative of whether a match exists and whether the match is strong or weak, as taught by Lo. The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to enhance the accuracy of the verification method (Lo, col. 1, lines 55-58). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Pollard, Oliver, and O'Hara with Lo to obtain the invention as specified in claim 16.



Referring to claim 17, Lo further discloses the step of forwarding data representative of a picture to an expert analyst at an expert analyst's workstation (col. 6, lines 58-66 and figure 1).

Referring to claim 18, Lo further discloses that the forwarding of the data representative of the picture to an expert analyst at an analyst's workstation is responsive to the match data (col. 6, lines 58-66 and col. 8, lines 20-45).

Referring to claim 19, Lo further discloses that the forwarding of the data representative of the picture to an expert analyst at an analyst's workstation is responsive to data regarding known individuals (col. 5, line 62-col. 6, line 13 and col. 8, lines 34-44), but does not explicitly disclose that it is responsive to data regarding known high-risk individuals. However, O'Hara discloses a storage medium that includes data regarding known high-risk individuals, as noted above (claim 15). Therefore, the combination of Pollard, Oliver, O'Hara, and Lo disclose the step of forwarding of the data representative of the picture to an expert analyst at an analyst's workstation in responsive to data regarding known high-risk individuals.

### *Conclusion*

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Charles Kim whose telephone number is 571-272-7421. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon thru Thurs 8:30am to 6pm and alternating Fri 9:30am to 6pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Amelia Au can be reached on 571-272-7414. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2623

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



ck

May 27, 2005

  
AMELIA M. AU  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600